

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 14, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendment and following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 6-13 and 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Miner. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, “if the hold function is not enabled, directly ringing a called party device; if the hold function is enabled, automatically answering the call if the call corresponds to the one or more parameters of the hold function and placing the call on hold.” Miner fails to teach these features. Miner does not teach directly ringing the called party device. In Miner, the call is answered when it arrives by a VM (virtual machine), with no option of ringing the called party. Miner teaches that all calls are answered by the VM (see column 32, lines 1-64). There is no teaching in Miner of routing calls directly to the called party device without use of the VM. Thus, Miner cannot anticipate claim 6.

For at least the above reasons, claim 6 is patentable over Miner. Claims 7-13 and 21 depend from claim 6 and are patentable over Miner for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 6.

Independent claim 17 recites features similar to those discussed with reference to claim 6. Thus, claim 17 is patentable over Miner. Claims 18-20 and 22 depend from claim 17 and are patentable over Miner for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 17.

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Okun in view of Novak. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, “the determining based on a user input predetermined time period during which the incoming call is placed on hold, and a list including at least one predetermined potential calling party from whom incoming calls are placed on hold.” As noted by the Examiner, Okun fails to teach placing a caller on hold based on these parameters. In Okun, the called party places the call on hold by pressing a button as described in paragraph [0057]. There is no user input predetermined time period or

predetermined potential calling party used in Okun. The Examiner cites to an "inopportune" time, but this is not a user input predetermined time period as recited in claim 14.

Dutta was relied upon for allegedly teaching a time period and potential calling party being used to control whether a call is placed on hold. Dutta fails to teach a user input predetermined time period during which the incoming call is placed on hold. In Dutta, the mobile device is placed into a hold mode based on locations where Bluetooth commands force hold mode, not user input predetermined times. Thus, even if Okun and Dutta are combined, the use of a user input predetermined time period during which the incoming call is placed on hold is not taught or suggested.

For at least the above reasons, claim 14 is patentable Okun in view of Dutta. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14 and are patentable over Okun in view of Dutta for at least the reasons advance with respect to claim 14.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: September 11, 2007